

Proponents of this legislation have claimed that the Tribe has a unique history with this particular plot of land—this particular 55.3 acres of land—adjacent to the trust land. But from the history shown, the Tribe's interaction with the land is mostly that they have had friendly neighbors with whom they have traded goods.

As many of my colleagues are aware, I have great concerns that I have quite consistently expressed with further expanding the Federal Government's management or involvement in public lands, including trust lands.

Nevertheless, I have been engaging in negotiations, and I have made a number of good-faith efforts to develop a possible path forward—one in which the amount of acreage owned or held in trust by the Federal Government would not grow, while taking this land into trust for the Gila River Indian Community. While I continue to negotiate a path forward, I am not inclined to abandon this concern. This is a negotiation that has been in progress.

That said, with respect to the part of the request dealing specifically with S. 789, the RESPECT Act, I am willing to let that go. But if the request is to pass both of these by unanimous consent, I can't support that, and on that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, a couple of points. On taking 55.3 acres into trust, this is not like the Federal Government is going to have new land management responsibilities. This is a matter of principle for the Senator from Utah, and I recognize that; that he thinks, basically, no additional land should be taken into trust, even though this government-to-government relationship—this authority over these government relationships are enshrined in the Constitution of the United States and this government-to-government relationship has already been established by statutory law and the process for putting land into trust is already a well-established pathway. But what the Senator from Utah is saying is no more or we are going to have to do a one-for-one swap or even sometimes a two-for-one swap. You cannot have a net increase in the acreage, even if it is 53 acres, even if there is an established process.

And so, I do find that difficult to work with. I know that the Senators from Arizona are in discussions with the Senator from Utah.

We will find our way forward. This is 53 acres. It is important, obviously. We are going to enact this legislation.

I like the Senator from Utah. We will find a way on this one.

But if he would entertain an amendment to the request, then I would be pleased to pass the RESPECT Act by voice vote, if that is something that the Senator from Utah would be amenable to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. I fully am amenable to that, with the RESPECT Act.

REPEALING EXISTING SUB- STANDARD PROVISIONS ENCOUR- AGING CONCILIATION WITH TRIBES ACT

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 53, S. 789.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 789) to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to Indians.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHATZ. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. SCHATZ. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate and the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 789) was passed, as follows:

S. 789

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Repealing Existing Substandard Provisions Encouraging Conciliation with Tribes Act" or the "RESPECT Act".

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE LAWS RELATING TO INDIANS.

(1) Section 2080 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 72) is repealed.

(2) Section 2100 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 127) is repealed.

(3) Section 2 of the Act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 449, chapter 132; 25 U.S.C. 128), is repealed.

(4) The first section of the Act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 424, chapter 132; 25 U.S.C. 129), is amended under the heading "CHEYENNES AND ARAPAHOES," by striking "that the Secretary of the Interior be authorized to withhold, from any tribe of Indians who may hold any captives other than Indians, any moneys due them from the United States until said captives shall be surrendered to the lawful authorities of the United States".

(5) Section 2087 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 130) is repealed.

(6) Section 3 of the Act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 449, chapter 132; 25 U.S.C. 137), is repealed.

(7) Section 2101 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 138) is repealed.

(8) Section 7 of the Act of June 23, 1879 (21 Stat. 35, chapter 35; 25 U.S.C. 273), is repealed.

(9) The first section of the Act of March 3, 1893 (27 Stat. 612, chapter 209), is amended—

(A) under the heading "MISCELLANEOUS SUPPORTS." (27 Stat. 628; 25 U.S.C. 283), by striking the last 2 undesignated paragraphs; and

(B) under the heading "FOR SUPPORT OF SCHOOLS." (27 Stat. 635; 25 U.S.C. 283), by striking the second undesignated paragraph.

(10) Section 18 of the Act of June 30, 1913 (38 Stat. 96, chapter 4; 25 U.S.C. 285), is amended by striking the tenth undesignated paragraph.

(11) The Act of June 21, 1906 (34 Stat. 325, chapter 3504), is amended under the heading "COMMISSIONER." under the heading "I. GENERAL PROVISIONS." (34 Stat. 328; 25 U.S.C. 302) by striking the fourth undesignated paragraph.

Mr. SCHATZ. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHATZ. I yield the floor.

ENDLESS FRONTIER ACT— Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

S. 1260

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, it will come as no surprise to anyone in this Chamber that I am extremely proud to be born and raised in Michigan.

Our State leads the world in innovation. We are the leaders in making things—furniture, appliances, wind turbines and solar components and so much more, and, of course, we are the home of the automobile and the automotive assembly line and the middle class of America.

Our workers put the world on four wheels. They built an economy strong enough that those same workers could afford to buy one or two or more cars and trucks that they made.

Yet our Nation faces a stark choice right now, and that is why the bill in front of us tonight is so very important. We can continue to invest in making things in America or we can decide that it is not really worth the trouble anymore.

We can continue to lead the world in the research and development of breakthrough technologies or we can allow other countries to surge ahead while we tread water. And we can stand with our workers on the assembly lines as they build the vehicles of the future or we can watch our plants close, ship our jobs overseas, and let our middle class wither away—our choice.

But I would argue that we may have no choice. That is no choice at all. We know what we need to do. It is time to stand on the side of American manufacturing, as this bill does. It is time to stand on the side of American ingenuity, as this bill does. And it is time to stand on the side of American workers and our American middle class.

It is time to take a stand and invest in our shared future and build an economy that can compete with anyone, anywhere, anytime. That is America. That is what the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act does.

One of our first orders of business is to increase our investments in research and development, and we have no time to lose. American R&D spending is